Topics
My posts
Drafts
Preferences
More
CATEGORIES
Philosophy
Society, Government…
Science, Technology,…
Psychology and Mind
Religion and Spiritua…
Creative Writing

Existence Is Infinite (2025)

Philosophy Forums Philosophy

Oct 1
5 / 198
Oct 1
2d ago

daniel j lavender Oct 1

“Nothing” And Sloppy Language

Use of the term “nothing” is often indicative of sloppy language. One such expression is “I have nothing in my pocket”. Is it really an accurate statement?

First let’s establish what a pocket is. A pocket is, in common parlance, typically a compartment or area designed for, designated for, or capable of storage. This considered a pocket would practically always concern space or room for containment. A pocket, such as a pants pocket, almost always contains lint, or tiny fibers, keys, coins or even air. Unless the pocket is vacuum-sealed and airtight, which obviously is quite impractical. A pocket, by definition, concerns storage, it concerns room for some thing or some other thing. For a pocket to contain nothing, for there to be nothing in a pocket including room for containment the pocket or compartment material would have to be completely collapsed, completely condensed, sealed and secured with no capacity for storage. In which case it wouldn’t be capable of storage or capable of containment anyway. It would virtually be complete integration. There wouldn’t be anything contained within because there couldn’t be anything contained within. It wouldn’t be a pocket. It would seemingly be some extremely dense fabric or mass incapable of containment. Which of course would be something and not nothing. It’s a fallacious statement all the way around.

A similar statement is “nothing is on the table”. To demonstrate how this is erroneous one simply has to reference the lacquer or the coat of finish on the table. Or the microscopic dust particles or fibers upon the table undetectable to the unaided eye. From another perspective perhaps the very implications of “on the table” should be examined. By “on the table” is it meant “making contact with the table”? In which case air, as well, would be “on the table” as air would be making contact with the table. In other words, there are things on the table. There is not nothing, there is not no thing on the table. Nothing, no thing, does not exist to be on anything.

Someone may claim to hear nothing. However nothing is not heard. What is heard, what is perceived is silence. A condition, a circumstance is perceived. Else it could not be discussed or acknowledged. That which is perceived is, by definition, existence. Silence is perceived. Silence is something, not nothing. A word, a sound is perceived. Sound is something, not nothing. In the instance one lacks faculty of hearing one simply wouldn’t hear. Period. One would not “hear nothing”. Nothing is not and cannot be to be heard or sensed.

Someone may claim to smell nothing. However this would be incorrect. The individual would be smelling, they would be perceiving, they would just be smelling or perceiving a neutral environment. They would be smelling, or breathing, neutral atmosphere. They wouldn’t be smelling an unpleasant nor pleasant odor. There would be no distinct, obvious odor or smell to identify. What is smelling? Breathing in particulates and determining certain characteristics such as foul or pleasant odor. The subject would simply be smelling or breathing in a neutral environment, breathing in neither foul nor pleasant but neutral atmosphere.

Use of the term “nothing” is often indicative of sloppy language. “I got it for nothing.” “I have nothing in my bank account.” These are two more examples. Both statements are false and prime examples of sloppy language. The individual did not get whatever item for nothing or for no thing. The individual obtained whatever item for themselves or for someone else or for some purpose or some application. In the sense that no money or item of trade was used in the acquisition nothing is still not introduced or present. Rather money nor an item of trade was needed in the process; some particular thing, an existent thing, is simply not involved in that particular case. Still only things are involved; individuals, items, etc. Nothing or no thing is not introduced or involved because no thing is not and cannot be to be involved. The very notion of nothing or no thing itself is a concept, a contradictory concept, an abstraction of the mind and is also a thing. The individual does not have nothing in their bank account. They may have no funds but that does not indicate nothing. At the very least they have digits, they have address and contact details, they have information in their bank account. Nothing, no thing does not actually exist. Nothing, no thing does not actually have presence to be referenced. What actually is referenced is some particular thing which is not present or involved in that particular case.

---

daniel j lavender Oct 1

Summary

Existence simply *is*.

Existence does not depend on *any* definition.

Existence does not depend on *any* thing.

Existence *is* all things. There is no other upon which to depend.

The commonality of all things, the metaphorical fabric of all things is existence.

All variance, all difference, all opposition balances as simply being, as simply existence.

Existence is not dependent on perception or definitions however perception and definitions are significant tools for conscious beings to substantiate and understand existence.

1 Reply

---

daniel j lavender Oct 1

Linktree
daniellavender | Linktree 1
Linktree. Make your link do more.

Previous draft for reference:

> Existence Is Infinite (Revised) Philosophy
>
> Existence Is Infinite Daniel J. Lavender Abstract Existence is infinite in extent and eternal in duration. Only nothing or nonexistence could actually limit existence; however, nothing or nonexistence is not and cannot be. Existence is infinite, existence is not limited as there is [not] nothing beyond existence to limit or restrict it. Terms And Definitions Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way. Infin…

---

daniel j lavender Oct 1

The Term Existence

Terms and definitions are crucial for any topic of discussion.

I contend the terms and definitions presented within this ontology are more practical and more coherent than standard terms and definitions, specifically the term “existence”.

Standard definitions of existence are ambiguous and circular. They provide no means of substantiation.

Existence is commonly defined as:

Existence (noun)

1. The fact or state of existing; being
   (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition
   https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)

Existence (noun)

1. the fact or state of existing; being
   (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition
   https://www.thefreedictionary.com/existence)

Existence (noun)

1. a : the state or fact of having being especially independently of human consciousness and as contrasted with nonexistence
   (Existence. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster,
   https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/existence)

Existence is defined as being.

Being is defined as existence:

Being (noun)

1. The state or quality of having existence
   (American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language, Fifth Edition
   https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)

Being (noun)

1. the state or fact of existing; existence
   (Collins English Dictionary Complete and Unabridged, 12th Edition
   https://www.thefreedictionary.com/being)

Being (noun)

1. a : the quality or state of having existence
   (Being. Merriam-Webster.com Dictionary, Merriam-Webster, https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/being)

The terms and definitions are circular. Existence is being, being is existence. The terms form a circular loop.

If existence is being, and being existence, what is being or existence? They are undefined.

The ontology presented, however, precisely defines what existence is:

> daniel j lavender:
>
> *Existence (n.): Being; that which is perceived, at least in part; that which is interacted with, at least in part, in some way.*

There is no circular loop. Existence is explicitly defined with a practical, coherent definition.

With the standard terms existence is ambiguous; existence is being which is existence.

With the term provided existence is defined; existence is that which is perceived or interacted with, at least in part.

Not only are the standard terms circular and ambiguous, they also fail to provide any substantiation of existence as the term presented here.

With the definition provided one could point to a tree, or any other thing, and declare existence. The tree would be perceived or interacted with substantiating it as existence.

One could see an object, touch a texture, hear a sound, smell a fragrance and easily declare existence. With the standard definitions one would likely be rather perplexed.

The dual-nature definition, involving both perception and interaction, frees the philosophy from a purely biological, conscious perspective of perception.

The philosophy presented not only offers a comprehensive foundational ontology it also offers clearer, more practical and more coherent definitions of key terms as illustrated here.

The standard terms are locked in a vacuous loop of abstraction. They serve to relate some distant ambiguity.

The definition provided maintains abstraction while also breaking free of the circularity of standard terms by grounding itself in concrete, real world examples through practical means of substantiation.

2 Replies